

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/685,042		CAMERLO ET AL.		
	Examiner		Art Unit		
	Ishwar (I. B.) Patel		2841		

All Participants:

(1) Ishwar (I. B.) Patel.

(2) Jeffrey Duquette (Reg. 45,487).

Date of Interview: 23 February 2006

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 3-11 and 13-19

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.


☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Being allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called applicant's representative and asked to amend base claims 1, 11, 16 and 19 to avoid possible objection of the claims regarding the language of the limitation "and (iv) each concave edge has a radius which is at least twice as large in value as every convex edge." Decided to add the word "radius of" before every convex edge. Also, asked to amend the base claims 1, 11, 16 and 19 by adding the limitation of the detail of the mask (as claimed in the claim 6) to more clearly recite the invention and to further overcome the prior art of record. Applicant's representative gave authorization to amend the claims by examiner's amendments. Further, it was confirmed that claims 33-37, as stated on line 9 on page 9 of response filed on February 3, 2006, are not there. It was just a typographical mistake.